

## REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, claim 1 is objected to because of informalities. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that claim 1 is different from the original claim 1 as filed. In response, Applicants amended claim 1 to restore claim 1 to its original form, which was corrected with the filing of Supplemental Amendment B filed on May 21, 2004. Applicant further amended claim 1 to delete “unit” and insert “device” in line 5 and to insert “information of” in line 8 of claim 1. For this reason, withdrawal of the objection to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 15, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Bonder et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,265). In response, Applicant amended the claims to clarify that the recording of a mapping of the issued key information is to “information of” the key information retaining unit, and respectfully traverse.

The Office Action asserts that Bonder discloses a recording module 22 (i.e., memory) recording and mapping the issued key information to information of the key information retaining unit 11 (i.e. intelligent key). However, Bonder’s description as it pertains to memory is only “The key programmer 20 contains a microprocessor or microcontroller 21, a random access memory (RAM) 22” (Col. 5, lines 33-34). Further, Bonder discloses “The only fingerprint data which is maintained in the programmer 20 is the data for an authorized programming operator as long as it remains valid for a particular operator. The operator data can be changed only when additional factors are entered such as a PIN number, an authorized dealer PIN number, an authorized fingerprint of an authorized

programming operator, etc.” (Col. 5, Ins. 43-45). Accordingly, Applicant believes that the key programmer 20 saves fingerprint data in the RAM 22. Therefore, Bonder does not teach “a recording module” that records a mapping of the issued key information to information of the key information retaining unit.

In contrast, independent claims 1, 15 and 29 are amended to clarify that the recording module records a mapping of the issued key information to information of the key information retaining unit. Accordingly, the key information issuing device of the present invention advantageously manages the issued key information to information of the key information retaining unit. That is, the key information issuing device is aware of which key information retaining unit is issuing which key information.

In Bonder, the key programmer 20 can identify the operator and decide whether the operator is authorized or not by checking a fingerprint. However, the key programmer 20 does not maintain the information by mapping the issued key information to the information of the key information retaining unit.

Furthermore, Bonder shows that the key programmers use initialized data stored in the key or changes in the data as required. This is different from the present invention, wherein the key information issuing device is used to output the key information to the key information retaining unit and also to record a mapping of the issued key information to information of the key information retaining unit. The key information issuing device of the present invention receives wireless signals from the key information retaining device and can decode the information contained in the wireless signals that is

encrypted. This is done by using the key information based on the mapping of the issued key information to information of the key information retaining unit.

Since Bonder fails to disclose a key information issuing device, method of managing key information issued to a key information retaining device, or a readable-by-computer recording medium that manages key information issued to a key information retaining device by recording a mapping of the issued key information to information of the key information retaining unit, withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claims 1, 15 and 19 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, 14, 16-19, 28, 30-33 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Bonder in combination with Dsai (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,173) or Weiss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,522,240). Applicant traverses these rejections for the reasons recited above.

More specifically, since claims 2-5, 14, 16-19, 28, 30-33 and 42 ultimately depend upon independent claims 1, 15 and 29, they necessarily include all of the features of their associated independent claims plus other additional features. Thus, Applicants submit that the §103 rejection of these claims has also been overcome for the same reasons mentioned above to overcome the rejection of independent claims 1, 15 and 29, and also because Desai and Weiss fail to overcome the deficiencies of Bonder. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 2-5, 14, 16-19, 28, 30-33 and 42 also be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

  
Joseph P. Fox  
Registration No. 41,760

November 3, 2004

300 South Wacker Drive - Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: (312) 360-0080  
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315  
Customer Number 24978

P:\DOCS\3169\66103\737498.DOC